

Hillander will allow the brave men and women defending freedom abroad to spend more time in touch with their loved ones. The students at Hillander set a wonderful example of how a small unselfish effort can greatly benefit our military personnel.

I am proud to have compassionate and caring youngsters in my district, and I know our soldiers abroad will greatly appreciate their efforts.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF OFFICIAL OBJECTORS FOR PRIVATE CAL- ENDAR FOR 109TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On behalf of the majority and minority leaderships, the Chair announces that the official objectors for the Private Calendar for the 109th Congress are as follows:

For the majority:

Mr. COBLE of North Carolina;

Mr. CHABOT of Ohio; and

Mr. FEENEY of Florida.

For the minority:

Mr. BOUCHER of Virginia;

Mr. SCHIFF of California; and

Mr. GRIJALVA of Arizona.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GUTKNECHT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the Special Order time of the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

U.S. SUPREME COURT DECISION STRIKES SERIOUS BLOW TO CON- CEPT OF PRIVATE PROPERTY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Supreme Court yesterday handed down a decision that will ultimately be very harmful to our freedom and our prosperity. In a 5-to-4 decision, the Court decided that a city government could take a private home by eminent domain for the benefit of another private party.

This decision was in the case of *Kelo v. City of New London, Connecticut*,

and it strikes a serious blow right at the heart of or the concept of private property, which our Founding Fathers believed in so strongly. If anyone does not realize how important private ownership of property is to both our freedom and our prosperity, they should do a more detailed study of economics and world history. The most prosperous countries in the world, without exception, have been those that gave the greatest protection to private property. Not only is it important to individuals, it is important to government as well.

It sounds great for a politician to create a park; however, now that we have so many Federal, State, and local parks, we cannot take care of them properly. Also, most of them are vastly underused. But more importantly, when property goes from private to public ownership, it goes off the tax rolls. This means that taxes have to continually go up on the property that remains in private hands for the always increasing costs of schools and other public functions.

We can never satisfy government's appetite for money or land, Mr. Speaker. I will repeat that. We can never satisfy government's appetite for money or land. They always want more. The Federal Government already owns over 30 percent of the land in this Nation. Another 20 percent is held by State or local governments or quasi-governmental agencies. So today about half the land is in some type of public ownership. But government always wants more and is continuously taking more. In addition, there are more and more restrictions being placed on the land that remains in private ownership, so developers are having to crowd more and more people into apartments, townhouses, or homes on postage-stamp lots, all at a rapidly escalating prices.

Some have said we do not need to worry about this decision because this new power will be used sparingly by local governments. Those who say that either do not really believe very strongly in the right of private property or they do not realize how government at all levels can rationalize or justify almost anything, especially almost any taking of property.

Justice Sandra Day O'Connor in her dissent against the Court's decision said: "The Court today significantly expands the meaning of public use. It holds that the sovereign may take private property currently put to ordinary private use and give it over for new, ordinary private use so long as the new use is predicted to generate some secondary benefit for the public, such as increased tax revenue . . . But nearly any lawful use of real private property can be said to generate some incidental benefit to the public. Thus," she said, "there really is now no realistic constraint on the taking of private property."

Justice O'Connor went on to say, "For who among us can say she already

makes the most productive or attractive possible use of her property? The specter of condemnation hangs over all property. Nothing is to prevent the State from replacing any Motel 6 with a Ritz Carlton, any home with a shopping mall, or any farm with a factory."

She later added, "Any property may now be taken for the benefit of another private party, but the fallout from this decision will not be random. The beneficiaries are likely to be those citizens with disproportionate influence and power in the political process . . . As for the victims, the government now has license to transfer property from those with fewer resources to those with more. The Founders cannot have intended this perverse result."

In my home region of East Tennessee, government has taken huge amounts of land. Almost all has been taken from poor or lower-income families who would be wealthy today if they still had their beautiful land. Justice Clarence Thomas said in his dissent, "Something has gone seriously awry with this Court's interpretation of the Constitution. Though citizens are safe from the government in their homes, the homes themselves are not." Justice Thomas went on to say, "The consequences of today's decision are not difficult to predict, and promise to be harmful . . . Extending the concept of public purpose to encompass any economically beneficial goal guarantees that these losses will fall disproportionately on the poor."

Mr. Speaker, this decision by the U.S. Supreme Court is a very dangerous one and will end up being especially harmful to the poor and lower-income and working people of this country.

Thomas Jefferson once said, "A government big enough to give you everything you want is a government big enough to take away everything you have."

TRIBUTE TO MAYOR JERALD AUGUST GLAUBITZ

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CONAWAY.) Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the men and women of America's greatest generation, the generation that saved freedom and defeated tyranny, pass quietly from this life each day. Too quietly, I believe. For this generation of Americans must never forget that we are the beneficiaries of their selfless acts and their sacrifice. They made America what it is today: free, strong, and vibrant.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I want to recognize and salute the many contributions of one member of that great generation, Jerald August Glaubitz, who passed away on April 26 at the age of 84.

□ 1700

Jerry Glaubitz was a constituent of mine. He was a friend of mine. In some